



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/552,262

04/19/2000

Jerry Dunietz

5486-0218PUS2

4106

67321

7590

05/14/2008

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

PO Box 747

FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

BASHORE, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/552,262
Filing Date: April 19, 2000
Appellant(s): DUNIETZ ET AL.

William D. Titcomb
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed February 19, 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed June 18, 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

5,745,745	TADA ET AL.	4-1998
6,035,268	CARUS ET AL.	3-2000

Open eBook Publication Structure 1.0, published 9/16/1999

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tada et al. (hereinafter "Tada"), US 5,745,745 patented 4/28/1998.

Regarding independent claim 1 and dependent claim 9, Tada teaches identifying tags in a document having markup language content in col. 1 lines 7-13, col. 21 lines 50-64, and col. 22 lines 6-20. Tada teaches replacing the tag with an alias in col. 22 lines 6-20. Tada teaches in col. 22 line 24 - col. 23 line 24 inserting a control code, which is a flag, to form an encoded structure indicating whether the information contained within the tags should be searched or not. Tada teaches in col. 6 lines 30 - col. 7 line 20 that these enhancements enable more efficient searching by excluding unnecessary sections of the text. Tada teaches an implementation on a computer readable medium in fig. 1 and col. 11 line 39 - col. 12 line 5.

While Tada teaches a relation maintained between the alias and the flag, Tada does not forcefully disclose (specifically recite) a "*separation variable*" for separating a tag from content. However, Tada teaches replacing a start tag with a control code

variable “α” (Tada column 22 lines 24-28), providing reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan that said tag is “separated” and using said code to also reflect replacement (separation from content) accordingly, providing the benefit of separation variables to clearly distinguish separation.

Although Tada does not forcefully teach (specifically recite) “*inserting at least one flag within the tag...*”, nevertheless, Tada teaches a relation maintained between tags (alias), flags (control codes/variables) along with logical structure identification numbers (see also Tada at least Figures 11, 12, 15, 28), providing reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan of insertions, so as to facilitate correct references within the encoded structure.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Tada teaches identifying tags in a document having markup language content in col. 1 lines 7-13, col. 21 lines 50-64, and col. 22 lines 6-20. Tada teaches replacing at least one attribute type within the tag with an attribute alias, wherein the attribute alias is a predefined representation for the attribute type in col. 22 lines 6-20.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Tada teaches inserting a position flag to indicate whether the tag is a start tag or an end tag in col. 22 lines 6-20.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Tada teaches inserting a no search flag in association

with a portion of the content information, whereby a no search field may be readily identified

and skipped during a run-time linear search in col. 22 line 24 - col. 23 line 24.

Regarding independent claim 16 and dependent claim 18, Tada teaches identifying

tags in a document having markup language content in col. 1 lines 7-13, col. 21 lines 50-64, and

col. 22 lines 6-20. Tada teaches replacing the tag with an alias whereby the tag may be readily

identified during run-time parsing of the document in col. 22 lines 6-20. Tada teaches an

implementation on a computer readable medium in fig. 1 and col. 11 line 39 - col. 12 line 5.

While Tada teaches a relation maintained between the alias and the flag, Tada does not forcefully disclose (specifically recite) a “*separation variable*” for separating a tag from content. However, Tada teaches replacing a start tag with a control code variable “ α ” (Tada column 22 lines 24-28), providing reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan that said tag is “separated” and using said code to also reflect

replacement (separation from content) accordingly, providing the benefit of separation variables to clearly distinguish separation.

Although Tada does not forcefully teach (specifically recite) “*inserting at least one flag within the tag...*”, nevertheless, Tada teaches a relation maintained between tags (alias), flags (control codes/variables) along with logical structure identification numbers (see also Tada at least Figures 11, 12, 15, 28), providing reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan of insertions, so as to facilitate correct references within the encoded structure.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Tada teaches identifying tags in a document having
markup language content in col. 1 lines 7-13, col. 21 lines 50-64, and col. 22 lines 6-20.
Tada
teaches replacing at least one attribute type within the tag with an attribute alias,
wherein the
attribute alias is a predefined representation for the attribute type in col. 22 lines 6-20.

Regarding independent claim 19, Tada teaches a tag having encoded therein a predefined integer alias for the tag in col. 1 lines 7-13, col. 21 lines 50-64, and col. 22 lines 6-20.

Tada teaches replacing the tag with the alias in col. 22 lines 6-20. Tada teaches a content portion

Art Unit: 2178

associated with the tag in col. 1 lines 7-13, col. 21 lines 50-64, and col. 22 lines 6-20.

Tada

teaches an implementation on a computer readable medium in fig. 1 and col. 11 line 39
- col. 12

line 5.

While Tada teaches a relation maintained between the alias and the flag, Tada does not forcefully disclose (specifically recite) separating a tag from content. However, Tada teaches replacing a start tag with a control code variable “α” (Tada column 22 lines 24-28), providing reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan that said tag is “separated” and using said code to also reflect replacement (separation from content) accordingly, providing the benefit of separation variables to clearly distinguish separation.

Regarding dependent claim 20, Tada teaches wherein the tag further includes at least

one flag wherein the flag is selected from the group consisting of WORDBREAK, NOSEARCH,

STARTTAG, and ENDTAG in col. 22 line 24 - col. 23 line 24.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Tada teaches identifying tags in a document having

markup language content in col. 1 lines 7-13, col. 21 lines 50-64, and col. 22 lines 6-20.

Tada

teaches wherein the tag further includes at least one pre-defined attribute type alias in col. 22

lines 6-20.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tada as applied to claims above, and further in view of Open eBook Publication Structure 1.0" published 9/16/1999 (hereinafter "Open eBook").

Regarding dependent claim 3, Tada does not teach UTF-8 encoding the first encoded

document to form a second encoded document. Open eBook does teach UTF-8 encoding the

first encoded document to form a second encoded document in section 1.4.6. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings Open eBook and Tada to have created the claimed invention. It would

have been obvious and desirable to have used UTF-8 encoding taught by Open eBook to have

Art Unit: 2178

created a second document so that it only uses half of the space a UTF- 16 document would

require. This would have been desirable and beneficial for using less storage space and taking

less time to transmit the file.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Tada teaches compressing an encoded document to form

a compressed document in col. 6 lines 4-29.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Tada teaches replacing a tag with a reference string alias

in col. 22 lines 6-20. Tada does not teach replacing a URL within content information with a

reference string, whereby the file referenced by the URL may be readily accessed when selected

during run-time. Open eBook is partially based on HTML 4.0 as taught in sections 1.4.3 and 3.

Thus, Open eBook teaches replacing a URL with a reference string, whereby the file referenced

by the URL may be readily accessed when selected during run-time, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Tada and Open eBook to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to implemented the Open eBook teaching of replacing a URL with a reference string so that the user could have selected a descriptive reference string instead of a non-descriptive URL at run-time.

Regarding dependent claim 22, Tada does not teach wherein the markup language document is UTF-8 encoded. Open eBook does teach wherein a markup language document is UTF-8 encoded in section 1.4.6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings Open eBook and Tada to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used UTF-8 encoding taught by Open eBook to have encoded the markup language document so that it only uses half of the space a UTF-16 document would require. This would

have been desirable and beneficial for using less storage space and taking less time to transmit the file.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Tada teaches compressing an encoded document to form a compressed document in col. 6 lines 4-29.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tada as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Carus et al. (hereinafter "Carus"), US 6,035,268 provisional filed 8/22/1996.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Tada teaches identifying tags in a document having markup language content in col. 1 lines 7-13, col. 21 lines 50-64, and col. 22 lines 6-20. Tada teaches replacing the tag with an alias in col. 22 lines 6-20. Tada teaches in col. 22 line 24 - col. 23 line 24 inserting a control code, which is a flag, to form an encoded structure indicating

Art Unit: 2178

whether the information contained within the tags should be searched or not. Tada teaches in

col. 6 lines 30 - col. 7 line 20 that these enhancements enable more efficient searching by

excluding unnecessary sections of the text. Thus, Tada teaches pre-computing a text to improve

run-time search operation as is further described in col. 6 lines 30 - col. 7 line 20. Tada teaches

an implementation on a computer readable medium in fig. 1 and col. 11 line 39 - col. 12 line 5.

Tada does not teach comparing a left and right term to determine if they are part of a

single word and if they left and right terms are not part of a single word, inserting a word break

flag between the left and right terms. Carus does teach comparing a left and right term to

determine if they are part of a single word and if they left and right terms are not part of a single

word, inserting a word break flag between the left and right terms in col. 2 line 62 - col. 3 line 31

and col. 5 lines 51-67. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

Art Unit: 2178

the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Tada and Carus to have created the claimed invention. Carus notes that identifying the word breaks is a computationally

expensive process in col. 2 lines 46-61. Thus, it would have been obvious and desirable to have

implemented the word break identification of Carus in the text search improvement pre-processing so that the computationally expensive step of identifying word breaks would have

been performed prior to the run-time search. Since Tada is also trying to pre-process text to

improve run-time performance by reducing the run-time computational burden, this combination

would have been very desirable to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tada, in view of Carus et al. (hereinafter "Carus"), US 6,035,268 provisional filed 8/22/1996.

Regarding independent claim 10 and dependent claim 11, Tada teaches identifying tags in a document having markup language content in col. 1 lines 7-13, col. 21 lines 50-64, and col. 22 lines 6-20. Tada teaches replacing the tag with an alias in col. 22 lines 6-20. Tada teaches in col. 22 line 24 - col. 23 line 24 inserting a control code, which is a flag, to form an encoded structure indicating whether the information contained within the tags should be searched or not. Tada teaches in col. 6 lines 30 - col. 7 line 20 that these enhancements enable more efficient searching by excluding unnecessary sections of the text. Thus, Tada teaches pre-computing a text to improve run-time search operation as is further described in col. 6 lines 30 - col. 7 line 20. Tada teaches an implementation on a computer readable medium in fig. 1 and col. 11 line 39 - col. 12 line 5.

Tada does not teach comparing a left and right term to determine if they are part of a single word and if they left and right terms are not part of a single word, inserting a word break

Art Unit: 2178

flag between the left and right terms. Carus does teach comparing a left and right term to

determine if they are part of a single word and if they left and right terms are not part of a single

word, inserting a word break flag between the left and right terms in col. 2 line 62 - col. 3 line 31

and col. 5 lines 51-67. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Tada and Carus to have created the

claimed invention. Carus notes that identifying the word breaks is a computationally expensive

process in col. 2 lines 46-61. Thus, it would have been obvious and desirable to have implemented the word break identification of Carus in the text search improvement pre-processing so that the computationally expensive step of identifying word breaks would have

been performed prior to the run-time search. Since Tada is also trying to pre-process text to

improve run-time performance by reducing the run-time computational burden, this combination

would have been very desirable to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Claims 12 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tada et al. (hereinafter "Tada"), US 5,745,745 patented 4/28/1998.

Regarding independent claim 12 and dependent claim 13, Tada teaches identifying a tag within a document associated with a portion of content in col. 1 lines 7-13, col. 21 lines 50-64, and col. 22 lines 6-20. Tada teaches in col. 22 line 24 - col. 23 line 24 inserting a control code, which is a flag, to form an encoded structure indicating whether the information contained within the tags should be searched or not. Tada teaches in col. 6 lines 30 - col. 7 line 20 that these enhancements enable more efficient searching by excluding unnecessary sections of the text. Thus, Tada teaches pre-computing the text to improve run-time search operations. Tada teaches an implementation on a computer readable medium in fig. 1 and col. 11 line 39 - col. 12

line 5.

Tada does not teach that the no search flag is conditionally inserted based on determining

whether the portion is to be displayed for viewing by a reading device. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified

Tada to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have

used the search exclusion technique of Tada to have excluded portions which are not to be

displayed by a viewing device from searching. This would have corresponded to the goal of

Tada of improving run-time search operations as described in col. 6 lines 30 - col. 7 line 20.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

"Open eBook Publication Structure 1.0" (hereinafter "Open eBook") published 9/16/1999.

Regarding independent claim 14 and dependent claim 15, Open eBook teaches a document structure partially based on XML, HTML, and other document technologies in section 1.4 pages 3-7. Thus, Open eBook teaches using and identifying Uniform Resource Locators (URL) within a document. Open eBook teaches in section 2.3 on page 18 a manifest file which contains both a URL and an associated reference string. Open eBook describes a computer readable medium implementation in the reading device definition in section 1.3 on page 2. Open eBook does not specifically teach replacing part of a URL identified in the document with the reference string and a flag for the file. However replacing a URL with a reference string is described was known by the linking technology of HTML at the time of the invention on which Open eBook is partially based. This allowed a the string to be displayed and the actual details of the URL hidden fi'om display, but appended to the string. When the string was selected by a

Art Unit: 2178

user, the URL was activated. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified Open eBook to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have modified Open eBook to have

replaced URLs in the document with the associated reference string so that the link would have

been more descriptive to the user.

Claims 24-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Open eBook Publication Structure 1.0" published 9/16/1999 (hereinafter "Open eBook") in view of Tada et al. (hereinafter "Tada"), US 5,745,745 patented 4/28/1998.

Regarding independent claim 24, Open eBook teaches a root directory in sections 2 and

2.1 on pages 1 and 12. The package element is the outermost element in a package file and all other elements are nested within it, thus it is the root directory. Open eBook teaches a content

subdirectory linked to the root directory, the content subdirectory having nested therein at least

one linked content file providing content information relating to the electronic book in sections 2

and 2.1 on pages 11 and 12. The package element is the outermost element in a package file and

all the other elements are nested within it, thus the other elements are contained in a subdirectory

linked to the root directory. The subdirectory is described by the manifest, which Open eBook

describes in section 2.3.

Open eBook does not teach wherein the content file is pre-computed and encoded to

minimize run-time requirements. Tada does teach a content file which is pre-computed and

encoded to minimize run-time requirements in col. 1 lines 7-13, col. 21 lines 50-64, col. 22 lines

6-20, and col. 22 line 24 - col. 23 line 24. Tada teaches in col. 6 lines 30 - col. 7 line 20 the

advantage of decreased search time as a result of pre-computing and encoding the content file. It

Art Unit: 2178

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

have combined the teachings of Open eBook and Tada to have created the claimed invention. It

would have been obvious and desirable to have used the content file pre-computing and encoding

as taught by Tada to have enabled fast run-time search operations on a the Open eBook, which is

often implemented on a low power portable reading device.

Regarding dependent claim 25, Open eBook teaches at least one link destination index

file linked to the content file in section 2.3 page 18.

Regarding dependent claim 26, Open eBook teaches a page break index providing an

index of page break corresponding to the electronic book in sections 2.3, 2.4 and 2.6 pages 18,

19, and 21.

Regarding dependent claim 27, Open eBook teaches a metadata file linked to the root

directory and having information about the electronic book in sections 2.2 pages 12-17.

Regarding dependent claim 28, Open eBook teaches a manifest file linked to the root

directory providing a listing of the files in the content subdirectory relating to the electronic book

in section 2.3 page 18.

Regarding dependent claim 29, Open eBook teaches using at least one Cascading Style

Sheet (CSS) file in section 4 pages 39-47.

Regarding dependent claim 30, Open eBook teaches a metadata file linked to the root

directory and having information about the electronic book in sections 2.2 pages 12-17.

Regarding dependent claim 31, Open eBook teaches a digital rights management

database linked to the root database in sections 2 and 2.1 pages 11 and 12.

Regarding independent claim 32 and dependent claim 35, Open eBook

teaches a root

directory in sections 2 and 2.1 on pages 11 and 12. The package element is the outermost

element in a package file and all other elements are nested within it, thus it is the root directory.

Open eBook teaches a content subdirectory linked to the root directory, the content subdirectory

having nested therein at least one linked content file providing content information relating to the

electronic book in sections 2 and 2.1 on pages 11 and 12. The package element is the outermost

element in a package file and all the other elements are nested within it, thus the other elements

are contained in a subdirectory linked to the tool directory. The subdirectory is described by the

manifest, which Open eBook describes in section 2.3.

Open eBook does not teach converting a document in a first format by processing the

document to pre-compute and encode the markup language within the document. Tada does teach converting a document in a first format by processing the document to pre-compute and

Art Unit: 2178

encode the markup language within the document in col. 1 lines 7-13, col. 21 lines 50-64, col. 22

lines 6-20, and col. 22 line 24 - col. 23 line 24. Tada teaches an implementation on a computer

readable medium in fig. 1 and col. 11 line 39- col. 12 line 5. Tada teaches in col. 6 lines 30-

col. 7 line 20 the advantage of decreased search time as a result of pre-computing and encoding

the document into a converted document. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Open eBook and

Tada to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have

used the document pre-computing and encoding as taught by Tada to have enabled fast run-time

search operations on a the Open eBook, which is often implemented on a low power portable

reading device.

Regarding dependent claim 33, Open eBook teaches wherein the first format is an Open

E-Book format in section 2 pages 11-21.

Regarding dependent claim 34, Open eBook teaches wherein the document is an electronic book in section 2 pages 11-21.

(10) Response to Argument

Pages 12 to top of page 14 is directed to a history of prosecution of the instant case. Beginning on page 14 of Appellant's Appeal Brief (hereinafter the Brief), Appellant argues the following issues, which are accordingly addressed below.

Claims 1-2, 5, 7, 9 and 16-21 are patentably distinguishable over Tada.
(page 14 of the Brief)

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As presented in the above rejection, while Tada teaches a relation maintained between the alias and the flag, Tada does not forcefully disclose (specifically recite) a "*separation variable*" for separating a tag from content. However, it is the examiner's opinion that Tada's teaching of start tag replacement with a control code variable " α " (Tada column 22 lines 24-28), at the very least, provides reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan that said tag is "separated"

and using said code reflects replacement (separation from content) accordingly, providing the benefit of separation variables to clearly distinguish separation.

Appellant argues that the claimed separation character may be a code character such as a Unicode character (Brief page 14), representative claim 1 does not define what the separation character is.

Appellant argues on page 14 of the brief that Tada does not teach "replacing the tag with an alias, wherein the alias is a pre-defined representation for the tag". The examiner respectfully disagrees. As recited in the instant rejection of claim 1, Tada teaches replacing the tag with an alias in col. 22 lines 6-20. Tada teaches in col. 22 line 24 - col. 23 line 24 inserting a control code, which is a flag, to form an encoded structure indicating whether the information contained within the tags should be searched or not. There is no reason why the above teaching cannot be reasonably interpreted as replacing a tag with an alias (replacing tags (strings) with identification codes). Claim 1 merely recites that the alias is a pre-defined representation for a tag. Tada teaches inserting a control code, which is a flag, to form an encoded structure.

Appellant argues that the examiner's use of reasonable suggestion stretches the teaching of Tada (page 17 of the Brief).

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Tada's teaching of relationships maintained between tags (i.e. alias), flags (control codes/variables) along with logical structure identification numbers (see also Tada at least Figures 11, 12, 15, 28),

providing reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan of “inserting” flags. The skilled artisan is cognizant of data and/or variable insertions within a page of text. Typical examples include “/”, “:”, and “-” symbols to separate data accordingly. If not clearly taught, then Tada's teaching clearly reinforces the suggestion of inserting symbols (code characters) into a document for separation purposes.

Appellant's arguments with respect to instant independent claims 16 and 19 (pages 18-19 of the Brief) are substantially similar to those previously presented (please see above). In addition, document's are typically “parsed” during runtime (i.e. at the time of document rendering). Tada's control codes are integers.

Claims 10 and 11 are patentably distinguishable over Tada in view of Carus. (pages 21-22 of the Brief).

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner admits that Tada does not teach comparing a left and right term to determine if they are part of a single word and if they left and right terms are not part of a single word, inserting a word break flag between the left and right terms. However, Carus does teach comparing a left and right term to determine if they are part of a single word and if they left and right terms are not part of a single word, inserting a word break flag between the left and right terms in col. 2 line 62 - col. 3 line 31 and col. 5 lines 51-67. Determination of word/page breaks can be reasonably interpreted as inserting a word break flag between characters.

Claims 12 and 13 are patentably distinguishable over Tada. (pages 22-23 of the Brief).

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Tada does not teach that the no search flag is conditionally inserted based on determining whether the portion is to be displayed for viewing by a reading device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Tada to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the search exclusion technique of Tada to have excluded portions which are not to be displayed by a viewing device from searching. This would have corresponded to the goal of Tada of improving run-time search operations as described in col. 6 lines 30 - col. 7 line 20.

Claims 24-32 are patentably distinguishable over Open eBook in view of Tada. (pages 23-25 of the Brief)

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Appellant's arguments on pages 18-19 of the Brief are substantially similar to those previously presented (please see above). In addition, it is noted that Open eBook does not teach wherein the content file is pre-computed and encoded to minimize run-time requirements. Tada does teach a content file which is pre-computed and encoded to minimize run-time requirements in col. 1 lines 7-13, col. 21 lines 50-64, col. 22 lines

Art Unit: 2178

6-20, and col. 22 line 24 - col. 23 line 24. Tada teaches in col. 6 lines 30 - col. 7 line 20 the advantage of decreased search time as a result of pre-computing and encoding the content file.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

William L. Bashore

/William L. Bashore/
William L. Bashore
Primary Examiner
Tech Center 2100

May 12, 2008

Conferees:

Doug Hutton (SPE 2176)

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100

Stephen Hong (SPE 2178)

/Stephen S. Hong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178